

This editorial was written as a response to Arizona's controversial anti-immigration law SB 1070. This law was partly, but not fully, revoked by the US Supreme Court and still allows police officers to stop anyone they suspected of not being a US citizen and ask for identification.

How Arizona law hurts Hispanic citizens

By Ruben Navarrette, CNN Contributor / June 26, 2012

5 First, here's what Arizona got wrong: Once upon a time, some lawmakers there decided that the state had a problem with illegal immigrants – most of whom are Hispanic. So they drafted a sweeping law that wound up inconveniencing, singling out and foisting second-class citizenship upon all Hispanics, including those who were born in the United States. [...]

10 In fact, it's sad to admit this, but, if state lawmakers had written a law that was more narrowly focused on the undocumented, they would likely have met much less resistance from opponents of the law. After all, how do you argue that people who shouldn't be here in the first place and are living here outside the law shouldn't be bothered by law enforcement?

15 You can't, because that would be crazy. But it's equally crazy, deeply offensive and profoundly un-American to do what Arizona did when it passed its law. It put a target on a subset of the state's population based on physical appearance and required them to carry around documents proving their legal residency or U.S. citizenship just in case a police officer stops them and demands to see paperwork.

For a moment there, the new Southwest resembled the old South Africa. You can't create a burdensome requirement like that. Not in this country. Not in this century. [...]

20 [W]hat's left of the racial and ethnic comity that was once as much a part of Arizona's cultural landscape as cactus and kachina dolls will fade away. That's a shame. I lived in Arizona in the late 1990s, when I wrote about immigration and other issues for the Arizona Republic. It was a beautiful place to be before it went mad.

25 It's also a shame to think about what will become of those U.S.-born Hispanics in the aftermath of the Supreme Court decision. I imagine we'll be hearing one troubling story after another of longtime residents being treated like trespassers on their own land.

This country owes them better than that. These folks bought into the promise of the American Dream. Some bought in all the way and gave all they had to give.

30 In the Mexican-American neighborhoods of South Phoenix, you can walk into a living room and see a photo over the fireplace of a son or grandson in his uniform, taken just before he set off for Kabul or Fallujah on a mission from which he never returned. Draped off the frame, maybe there is the Bronze Star or the Purple Heart.

35 Born in the United States just like their parents and grandparents before them, these people get up every morning and go to work. They pay their taxes, support their families and raise their kids into responsible adults. They vote, serve on juries, pledge allegiance to the flag. And, in all the years they've lived in this country – their country – they never once thought of themselves as anything other than full-blooded Americans.

That, someone else did for them.

40 Source: CNN.com (<http://edition.cnn.com/2012/06/26/opinion/navarrette-arizona-law-court/index.html>) – 23/11/2012

ANNOTATIONS:

- **to foist sth. on so.** (l. 5): to force sth. on so.
- **a subset of** (l. 15): a part of
- **paperwork** (l. 17): personal proof of identification
- **“the old South Africa”** (l. 18): until 1994, S. Africa was ruled by a white upper class which denied the black population basic human and political rights
- **comity** (l. 20): a friendly, social atmosphere
- **kachina dolls** (l. 21): ceremonial dolls of the Hopi, a tribe of Native Americans living in Arizona
- **“Bronze Star of Purple Heart”** (l. 32): military medals given to honour a soldier's personal commitment and his sacrifices
- **“serve on juries”** (l. 35): in the US, every citizen could potentially be called to serve on a jury in the courtroom to take part in deciding the outcome of a court case.

CARTOON (by Joe Heller, date of publication unknown):



TASKS:

1. Outline Navarra's comments on Arizona's law SB1070.
2. Examine the author's use of language and rhetorical strategies to convey his message and analyse how the cartoon given with the editorial delivers a similar message.
3. Discuss the author's claim that Arizona “went mad” (l. 23) by examining the two opposing opinions on how to approach the issue of Hispanic immigrants in Arizona.